

Presidential Movements.

We believe Gen. Grant to be an honest man. This is the highest tribute that can be paid to him. He has undoubtedly a professional pride, without ambition for political preferment, or partisan advancement. It has been proposed to make him Lieutenant General. This position would place him at the head of the army, and we have no doubt that honor would be more gratifying to him than the highest civil office in the gift of the people. In a recent letter, referring to the appointment of Lieutenant General, he gives utterance to the following sentiments:

"You should recollect that I have been highly honored already by the Government, and do not ask, or feel that I deserve, any thing more in the shape of honors or promotion; a success over the enemy is what I crave above every thing else, and desire to hold such an influence over those under my command as to enable me to use them to the best advantage to secure this end."

If a similar spirit animated and controlled the men now at the head of the Government, the country would be in a far different condition. Instead of this, a contest is being waged by the members of the party in power for the control of the Government, not for the restoration of the Union upon the basis of the Constitution. Mr. Lincoln is a candidate for the succession, and it is evident he will use the immense patronage at his control to that end. Mr. Chase is also ambitious for the Presidency, and he will urge for the nomination with radical zeal. We notice that General Banks and General Butler are also named in that connection, and their claims will be urged with exceeding pertinacity.

We notice that a "Union Lincoln Association" has been formed in New York, and it has issued a circular to which the names of many prominent and wealthy merchants of that city are attached, urging the re-nomination of Mr. Lincoln.

The old adage has it, that "money makes the mare go," and with the patronage at his control, it is evident that he will secure a re-nomination, and to that end he is using the influence of his position. We can only say that if the country is satisfied with the rule of the dominant party, it makes but little difference who is elected President; whether it be Lincoln, Chase, Butler, Banks, or any other man.

**Supreme Court Decision.**  
We have been favored with a copy of the Decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the State vs. Buzzer, relative to his defection. We presume the tax payers of this county could hardly read this decision without feeling almost indignant, and without entertaining a just respect for the opinion of the Supreme Judges than they would like to feel toward the opinion of men placed in that high and responsible position by their peers. We learn that the opinion was delivered by Hannan, and taken in any light, reflects no credit on him. If it expresses his opinion, he is no lawyer. If it does not, he is a dishonest man. In either event, he should be held accountable by the voters of the State. It is a decision in which not only the people of this county are interested, but also those of nearly every county in the State. We presume that, according to his logic, there are but few bonds of County Treasurers in the State that are worth the paper they are written upon.

We are pleased to learn that the attorneys for the State, Messrs. Holland and Buckley, are making an effort to obtain the reversing of the case; but whether they will succeed or not, we do not know. One thing, however, we do know—and that is, that justice and a true regard for sound and established principles of law, demand that the decision should be reversed.

The foregoing article from the National Defender published at Brookville, is rather a novel mode of urging the re-hearing of a case decided by the Supreme Court. It can hardly be supposed that when Mr. Holland is elected to the Supreme bench, he will consider such a mode of approach to his court either dignified or respectful. He ought not to set an example the imitation of which may plague the inventor.

The truth is, the case that arouses such a bitter outbreak of feeling, was a suit upon a County Treasurer's bond. The Treasurer had absconded with over \$20,000 of the State taxes; his securities were seized, and naturally enough saw their way to defend themselves. It was life and death with them, for most of them would have been ruined by an adverse judgment. On the other hand, if they were released, the tax upon the citizens of the county, to make good the delinquency, would have been a trifle in comparison.

There is an attempt to create a feeling on the part of the tax payers where none at present exists. When the case came up for trial, the counsel, who now concern themselves so deeply for the tax payers, would not submit the case to a jury of those very tax payers. The defendants were compelled to try the case by the Judge, or to submit to the inconvenience of a change of venue. The Judge, a perfectly honest and highly capable, though not infallible gentleman, gave judgment for over \$25,000 against all the defendants but one, whose signature, it was conceded, had been forged.

The Supreme Court reversed the case on two grounds: 1st. The action was wrongly brought on the relation of the Treasurer of State; the proper relation being the Auditor of State. 2d. The defendants were discharged, some by false representation made by the Treasurer when he solicited their signatures; and the others by the fraudulent act of presenting them a bond to sign, on which appeared the signatures of other persons who were not bound.

The opinion of Judge Hannan presents a careful and elaborate examination of the law and displays learning and research. It is not possible for an unbiased mind to read his argument without a very strong impression that his ground is impregnable, and his conclusion incontrovertible with the interests of the public. It is hardly fair for counsel, after taking the pains to print in their petition for a re-hearing the entire opinion of the Court and the whole of the evidence, to make an appeal through the newspapers to the tax payers of the county as a means of re-enforcing their argument for a re-hearing. It would be a paltry Court that could be so cheaply intimidated.

**Promotions.**  
The names of Colonels Gross, Colver, Wilder and Scribner were sent into the Senate on Tuesday for promotion to Brigadiers. It appears that after a protracted debate they were returned to the President with the information that only one more Brigadier General, in addition to those already appointed or nominated, was authorized by law, and requested that he should designate which of the four should fill the vacancy.

The Democratic State Central Committee of Ohio has fixed upon Monday, March 23, as the day for holding the State Convention, for the purpose of electing delegates to the National Convention, and nominating candidates for State officers.

The Springfield (Mass.) Republican, an Administration newspaper, says:

"Neither the Administration nor its party can stand under the load of such a derogatory suggestion. There is no need of it. It is not their least concern to make it so. If no honest and thorough effort is made to ferret out, expose and punish the thieves, then the Administration will be justly held responsible for their crimes."

The Eligibility of Governor Morton.

The Madison Courier, an intense Republican sheet, contains a communication from a correspondent which it terms one of the ablest and most experienced politicians of its age; taking grounds against the eligibility of Governor Morton to hold the office for another term. It makes but little, if any difference to the Democracy, whether the Republicans nominate O. P. Morton or Pop. Gov. Smith as their candidate for Governor, and one is as much entitled to public confidence as the other, but as His Excellency has been so great pains and expense to convince the people that he is constitutionally eligible to hold the office of Governor indefinitely, we give a Republican view of the question antagonistic to his claims. Says this able and most experienced Republican political correspondent of the Courier:

As this question is one purely of Constitutional law, it would be out of place to interpose suggestions, to interpolate anything of a personal or partisan character. The question is one that concerns the people of the entire State, and the vast public interests involved in the election of a Governor. O. P. Morton was elected and inaugurated as Lieutenant Governor, three days thereafter, Governor Lane, having vacated the office of Governor. O. P. Morton, Lieutenant Governor, was installed as Governor. The language of the Constitution, whatever may be said for or against its wisdom, is simple and easily understood, when it declares, see 1st, art. 5th, The executive power of the State shall be vested in a Governor. He shall hold his office during four years, and shall not be eligible more than four years in any period of eight years."

Reference to the debates in the Constitutional Convention on this clause will satisfy any one that the true intent and meaning of that body, in adopting this section, was to prevent the possibility of an executive incumbent employing the power and patronage of the office during one term, so as to secure its election to a second or subsequent term, thus doing all in its power to restrict the attention and fidelity of the executive to the proper discharge of the duties of that office. Has Governor P. Morton been Governor during the present term? If he has been Governor, he is ineligible for four years, and shall not be eligible more than four years in any period of eight years."

Secondly, the constitution provides in section 12, article 5, "The Governor shall be commander in chief of the military forces, and may call out the militia." "He (the Governor) shall, from time to time, give the General Assembly information touching the condition of the State, and recommend such measures as he shall deem expedient." Section 14 provides that every bill which shall pass the General Assembly shall be presented to the Governor, who shall approve or return it with his objections." Section 15 says "the Governor" shall have the power to grant reprieves, commutations, pardons, after conviction, &c., together with many other functions which the Constitution devolves directly on the Governor."

The present executive has done all this; he has been commander in chief of the militia of the State, he has called out the militia to repel invasion; he has communicated with the General Assembly, and given them information, and recommended such measures as he thought proper. We learn that the opinion was delivered by Hannan, and taken in any light, reflects no credit on him. If it expresses his opinion, he is no lawyer. If it does not, he is a dishonest man. In either event, he should be held accountable by the voters of the State. It is a decision in which not only the people of this county are interested, but also those of nearly every county in the State. We presume that, according to his logic, there are but few bonds of County Treasurers in the State that are worth the paper they are written upon.

We are pleased to learn that the attorneys for the State, Messrs. Holland and Buckley, are making an effort to obtain the reversing of the case; but whether they will succeed or not, we do not know. One thing, however, we do know—and that is, that justice and a true regard for sound and established principles of law, demand that the decision should be reversed.

The foregoing article from the National Defender published at Brookville, is rather a novel mode of urging the re-hearing of a case decided by the Supreme Court. It can hardly be supposed that when Mr. Holland is elected to the Supreme bench, he will consider such a mode of approach to his court either dignified or respectful. He ought not to set an example the imitation of which may plague the inventor.

The truth is, the case that arouses such a bitter outbreak of feeling, was a suit upon a County Treasurer's bond. The Treasurer had absconded with over \$20,000 of the State taxes; his securities were seized, and naturally enough saw their way to defend themselves. It was life and death with them, for most of them would have been ruined by an adverse judgment. On the other hand, if they were released, the tax upon the citizens of the county, to make good the delinquency, would have been a trifle in comparison.

There is an attempt to create a feeling on the part of the tax payers where none at present exists. When the case came up for trial, the counsel, who now concern themselves so deeply for the tax payers, would not submit the case to a jury of those very tax payers. The defendants were compelled to try the case by the Judge, or to submit to the inconvenience of a change of venue. The Judge, a perfectly honest and highly capable, though not infallible gentleman, gave judgment for over \$25,000 against all the defendants but one, whose signature, it was conceded, had been forged.

The Supreme Court reversed the case on two grounds: 1st. The action was wrongly brought on the relation of the Treasurer of State; the proper relation being the Auditor of State. 2d. The defendants were discharged, some by false representation made by the Treasurer when he solicited their signatures; and the others by the fraudulent act of presenting them a bond to sign, on which appeared the signatures of other persons who were not bound.

The opinion of Judge Hannan presents a careful and elaborate examination of the law and displays learning and research. It is not possible for an unbiased mind to read his argument without a very strong impression that his ground is impregnable, and his conclusion incontrovertible with the interests of the public. It is hardly fair for counsel, after taking the pains to print in their petition for a re-hearing the entire opinion of the Court and the whole of the evidence, to make an appeal through the newspapers to the tax payers of the county as a means of re-enforcing their argument for a re-hearing. It would be a paltry Court that could be so cheaply intimidated.

**Promotions.**  
The names of Colonels Gross, Colver, Wilder and Scribner were sent into the Senate on Tuesday for promotion to Brigadiers. It appears that after a protracted debate they were returned to the President with the information that only one more Brigadier General, in addition to those already appointed or nominated, was authorized by law, and requested that he should designate which of the four should fill the vacancy.

The Democratic State Central Committee of Ohio has fixed upon Monday, March 23, as the day for holding the State Convention, for the purpose of electing delegates to the National Convention, and nominating candidates for State officers.

The Springfield (Mass.) Republican, an Administration newspaper, says:

"Neither the Administration nor its party can stand under the load of such a derogatory suggestion. There is no need of it. It is not their least concern to make it so. If no honest and thorough effort is made to ferret out, expose and punish the thieves, then the Administration will be justly held responsible for their crimes."

The Madison Courier, an intense Republican sheet, contains a communication from a correspondent which it terms one of the ablest and most experienced politicians of its age; taking grounds against the eligibility of Governor Morton to hold the office for another term. It makes but little, if any difference to the Democracy, whether the Republicans nominate O. P. Morton or Pop. Gov. Smith as their candidate for Governor, and one is as much entitled to public confidence as the other, but as His Excellency has been so great pains and expense to convince the people that he is constitutionally eligible to hold the office of Governor indefinitely, we give a Republican view of the question antagonistic to his claims. Says this able and most experienced Republican political correspondent of the Courier:

As this question is one purely of Constitutional law, it would be out of place to interpose suggestions, to interpolate anything of a personal or partisan character. The question is one that concerns the people of the entire State, and the vast public interests involved in the election of a Governor. O. P. Morton was elected and inaugurated as Lieutenant Governor, three days thereafter, Governor Lane, having vacated the office of Governor. O. P. Morton, Lieutenant Governor, was installed as Governor. The language of the Constitution, whatever may be said for or against its wisdom, is simple and easily understood, when it declares, see 1st, art. 5th, The executive power of the State shall be vested in a Governor. He shall hold his office during four years, and shall not be eligible more than four years in any period of eight years."

Reference to the debates in the Constitutional Convention on this clause will satisfy any one that the true intent and meaning of that body, in adopting this section, was to prevent the possibility of an executive incumbent employing the power and patronage of the office during one term, so as to secure its election to a second or subsequent term, thus doing all in its power to restrict the attention and fidelity of the executive to the proper discharge of the duties of that office. Has Governor P. Morton been Governor during the present term? If he has been Governor, he is ineligible for four years, and shall not be eligible more than four years in any period of eight years."

Secondly, the constitution provides in section 12, article 5, "The Governor shall be commander in chief of the military forces, and may call out the militia." "He (the Governor) shall, from time to time, give the General Assembly information touching the condition of the State, and recommend such measures as he shall deem expedient." Section 14 provides that every bill which shall pass the General Assembly shall be presented to the Governor, who shall approve or return it with his objections." Section 15 says "the Governor" shall have the power to grant reprieves, commutations, pardons, after conviction, &c., together with many other functions which the Constitution devolves directly on the Governor."

The present executive has done all this; he has been commander in chief of the militia of the State, he has called out the militia to repel invasion; he has communicated with the General Assembly, and given them information, and recommended such measures as he thought proper. We learn that the opinion was delivered by Hannan, and taken in any light, reflects no credit on him. If it expresses his opinion, he is no lawyer. If it does not, he is a dishonest man. In either event, he should be held accountable by the voters of the State. It is a decision in which not only the people of this county are interested, but also those of nearly every county in the State. We presume that, according to his logic, there are but few bonds of County Treasurers in the State that are worth the paper they are written upon.

We are pleased to learn that the attorneys for the State, Messrs. Holland and Buckley, are making an effort to obtain the reversing of the case; but whether they will succeed or not, we do not know. One thing, however, we do know—and that is, that justice and a true regard for sound and established principles of law, demand that the decision should be reversed.

The foregoing article from the National Defender published at Brookville, is rather a novel mode of urging the re-hearing of a case decided by the Supreme Court. It can hardly be supposed that when Mr. Holland is elected to the Supreme bench, he will consider such a mode of approach to his court either dignified or respectful. He ought not to set an example the imitation of which may plague the inventor.

The truth is, the case that arouses such a bitter outbreak of feeling, was a suit upon a County Treasurer's bond. The Treasurer had absconded with over \$20,000 of the State taxes; his securities were seized, and naturally enough saw their way to defend themselves. It was life and death with them, for most of them would have been ruined by an adverse judgment. On the other hand, if they were released, the tax upon the citizens of the county, to make good the delinquency, would have been a trifle in comparison.

There is an attempt to create a feeling on the part of the tax payers where none at present exists. When the case came up for trial, the counsel, who now concern themselves so deeply for the tax payers, would not submit the case to a jury of those very tax payers. The defendants were compelled to try the case by the Judge, or to submit to the inconvenience of a change of venue. The Judge, a perfectly honest and highly capable, though not infallible gentleman, gave judgment for over \$25,000 against all the defendants but one, whose signature, it was conceded, had been forged.

The Supreme Court reversed the case on two grounds: 1st. The action was wrongly brought on the relation of the Treasurer of State; the proper relation being the Auditor of State. 2d. The defendants were discharged, some by false representation made by the Treasurer when he solicited their signatures; and the others by the fraudulent act of presenting them a bond to sign, on which appeared the signatures of other persons who were not bound.

The opinion of Judge Hannan presents a careful and elaborate examination of the law and displays learning and research. It is not possible for an unbiased mind to read his argument without a very strong impression that his ground is impregnable, and his conclusion incontrovertible with the interests of the public. It is hardly fair for counsel, after taking the pains to print in their petition for a re-hearing the entire opinion of the Court and the whole of the evidence, to make an appeal through the newspapers to the tax payers of the county as a means of re-enforcing their argument for a re-hearing. It would be a paltry Court that could be so cheaply intimidated.

The Eligibility of Governor Morton.

The Madison Courier, an intense Republican sheet, contains a communication from a correspondent which it terms one of the ablest and most experienced politicians of its age; taking grounds against the eligibility of Governor Morton to hold the office for another term. It makes but little, if any difference to the Democracy, whether the Republicans nominate O. P. Morton or Pop. Gov. Smith as their candidate for Governor, and one is as much entitled to public confidence as the other, but as His Excellency has been so great pains and expense to convince the people that he is constitutionally eligible to hold the office of Governor indefinitely, we give a Republican view of the question antagonistic to his claims. Says this able and most experienced Republican political correspondent of the Courier:

As this question is one purely of Constitutional law, it would be out of place to interpose suggestions, to interpolate anything of a personal or partisan character. The question is one that concerns the people of the entire State, and the vast public interests involved in the election of a Governor. O. P. Morton was elected and inaugurated as Lieutenant Governor, three days thereafter, Governor Lane, having vacated the office of Governor. O. P. Morton, Lieutenant Governor, was installed as Governor. The language of the Constitution, whatever may be said for or against its wisdom, is simple and easily understood, when it declares, see 1st, art. 5th, The executive power of the State shall be vested in a Governor. He shall hold his office during four years, and shall not be eligible more than four years in any period of eight years."

Reference to the debates in the Constitutional Convention on this clause will satisfy any one that the true intent and meaning of that body, in adopting this section, was to prevent the possibility of an executive incumbent employing the power and patronage of the office during one term, so as to secure its election to a second or subsequent term, thus doing all in its power to restrict the attention and fidelity of the executive to the proper discharge of the duties of that office. Has Governor P. Morton been Governor during the present term? If he has been Governor, he is ineligible for four years, and shall not be eligible more than four years in any period of eight years."

Secondly, the constitution provides in section 12, article 5, "The Governor shall be commander in chief of the military forces, and may call out the militia." "He (the Governor) shall, from time to time, give the General Assembly information touching the condition of the State, and recommend such measures as he shall deem expedient." Section 14 provides that every bill which shall pass the General Assembly shall be presented to the Governor, who shall approve or return it with his objections." Section 15 says "the Governor" shall have the power to grant reprieves, commutations, pardons, after conviction, &c., together with many other functions which the Constitution devolves directly on the Governor."

The present executive has done all this; he has been commander in chief of the militia of the State, he has called out the militia to repel invasion; he has communicated with the General Assembly, and given them information, and recommended such measures as he thought proper. We learn that the opinion was delivered by Hannan, and taken in any light, reflects no credit on him. If it expresses his opinion, he is no lawyer. If it does not, he is a dishonest man. In either event, he should be held accountable by the voters of the State. It is a decision in which not only the people of this county are interested, but also those of nearly every county in the State. We presume that, according to his logic, there are but few bonds of County Treasurers in the State that are worth the paper they are written upon.

We are pleased to learn that the attorneys for the State, Messrs. Holland and Buckley, are making an effort to obtain the reversing of the case; but whether they will succeed or not, we do not know. One thing, however, we do know—and that is, that justice and a true regard for sound and established principles of law, demand that the decision should be reversed.

The foregoing article from the National Defender published at Brookville, is rather a novel mode of urging the re-hearing of a case decided by the Supreme Court. It can hardly be supposed that when Mr. Holland is elected to the Supreme bench, he will consider such a mode of approach to his court either dignified or respectful. He ought not to set an example the imitation of which may plague the inventor.

The truth is, the case that arouses such a bitter outbreak of feeling, was a suit upon a County Treasurer's bond. The Treasurer had absconded with over \$20,000 of the State taxes; his securities were seized, and naturally enough saw their way to defend themselves. It was life and death with them, for most of them would have been ruined by an adverse judgment. On the other hand, if they were released, the tax upon the citizens of the county, to make good the delinquency, would have been a trifle in comparison.

There is an attempt to create a feeling on the part of the tax payers where none at present exists. When the case came up for trial, the counsel, who now concern themselves so deeply for the tax payers, would not submit the case to a jury of those very tax payers. The defendants were compelled to try the case by the Judge, or to submit to the inconvenience of a change of venue. The Judge, a perfectly honest and highly capable, though not infallible gentleman, gave judgment for over \$25,000 against all the defendants but one, whose signature, it was conceded, had been forged.

The Supreme Court reversed the case on two grounds: 1st. The action was wrongly brought on the relation of the Treasurer of State; the proper relation being the Auditor of State. 2d. The defendants were discharged, some by false representation made by the Treasurer when he solicited their signatures; and the others by the fraudulent act of presenting them a bond to sign, on which appeared the signatures of other persons who were not bound.

The opinion of Judge Hannan presents a careful and elaborate examination of the law and displays learning and research. It is not possible for an unbiased mind to read his argument without a very strong impression that his ground is impregnable, and his conclusion incontrovertible with the interests of the public. It is hardly fair for counsel, after taking the pains to print in their petition for a re-hearing the entire opinion of the Court and the whole of the evidence, to make an appeal through the newspapers to the tax payers of the county as a means of re-enforcing their argument for a re-hearing. It would be a paltry Court that could be so cheaply intimidated.

**Promotions.**  
The names of Colonels Gross, Colver, Wilder and Scribner were sent into the Senate on Tuesday for promotion to Brigadiers. It appears that after a protracted debate they were returned to the President with the information that only one more Brigadier General, in addition to those already appointed or nominated, was authorized by law, and requested that he should designate which of the four should fill the vacancy.

The Democratic State Central Committee of Ohio has fixed upon Monday, March 23, as the day for holding the State Convention, for the purpose of electing delegates to the National Convention, and nominating candidates for State officers.

The Springfield (Mass.) Republican, an Administration newspaper, says:

"Neither the Administration nor its party can stand under the load of such a derogatory suggestion. There is no need of it. It is not their least concern to make it so. If no honest and thorough effort is made to ferret out, expose and punish the thieves, then the Administration will be justly held responsible for their crimes."

The Madison Courier, an intense Republican sheet, contains a communication from a correspondent which it terms one of the ablest and most experienced politicians of its age; taking grounds against the eligibility of Governor Morton to hold the office for another term. It makes but little, if any difference to the Democracy, whether the Republicans nominate O. P. Morton or Pop. Gov. Smith as their candidate for Governor, and one is as much entitled to public confidence as the other, but as His Excellency has been so great pains and expense to convince the people that he is constitutionally eligible to hold the office of Governor indefinitely, we give a Republican view of the question antagonistic to his claims. Says this able and most experienced Republican political correspondent of the Courier:

As this question is one purely of Constitutional law, it would be out of place to interpose suggestions, to interpolate anything of a personal or partisan character. The question is one that concerns the people of the entire State, and the vast public interests involved in the election of a Governor. O. P. Morton was elected and inaugurated as Lieutenant Governor, three days thereafter, Governor Lane, having vacated the office of Governor. O. P. Morton, Lieutenant Governor, was installed as Governor. The language of the Constitution, whatever may be said for or against its wisdom, is simple and easily understood, when it declares, see 1st, art. 5th, The executive power of the State shall be vested in a Governor. He shall hold his office during four years, and shall not be eligible more than four years in any period of eight years."

Reference to the debates in the Constitutional Convention on this clause will satisfy any one that the true intent and meaning of that body, in adopting this section, was to prevent the possibility of an executive incumbent employing the power and patronage of the office during one term, so as to secure its election to a second or subsequent term, thus doing all in its power to restrict the attention and fidelity of the executive to the proper discharge of the duties of that office. Has Governor P. Morton been Governor during the present term? If he has been Governor, he is ineligible for four years, and shall not be eligible more than four years in any period of eight years."

Secondly, the constitution provides in section 12, article 5, "The Governor shall be commander in chief of the military forces, and may call out the militia." "He (the Governor) shall, from time to time, give the General Assembly information touching the condition of the State, and recommend such measures as he shall deem expedient." Section 14 provides that every bill which shall pass the General Assembly shall be presented to the Governor, who shall approve or return it with his objections." Section 15 says "the Governor" shall have the power to grant reprieves, commutations, pardons, after conviction, &c., together with many other functions which the Constitution devolves directly on the Governor."

The present executive has done all this; he has been commander in chief of the militia of the State, he has called out the militia to repel invasion; he has communicated with the General Assembly, and given them information, and recommended such measures as he thought proper. We learn that the opinion was delivered by Hannan, and taken in any light, reflects no credit on him. If it expresses his opinion, he is no lawyer. If it does not, he is a dishonest man. In either event, he should be held accountable by the voters of the State. It is a decision in which not only the people of this county are interested, but also those of nearly every county in the State. We presume that, according to his logic, there are but few bonds of County Treasurers in the State that are worth the paper they are written upon.

We are pleased to learn that the attorneys for the State, Messrs. Holland and Buckley, are making an effort to obtain the reversing of the case; but whether they will succeed or not, we do not know. One thing, however, we do know—and that is, that justice and a true regard for sound and established principles of law, demand that the decision should be reversed.

The foregoing article from the National Defender published at Brookville, is rather a novel mode of urging the re-hearing of a case decided by the Supreme Court. It can hardly be supposed that when Mr. Holland is elected to the Supreme bench, he will consider such a mode of approach to his court either dignified or respectful. He ought not to set an example the imitation of which may plague the inventor.

The truth is, the case that arouses such a bitter outbreak of feeling, was a suit upon a County Treasurer's bond. The Treasurer had absconded with over \$20,000 of the State taxes; his securities were seized, and naturally enough saw their way to defend themselves. It was life and death with them, for most of them would have been ruined by an adverse judgment. On the other hand, if they were released, the tax upon the citizens of the county, to make good the delinquency, would have been a trifle in comparison.

There is an attempt to create a feeling on the part of the tax payers where none at present exists. When the case came up for trial, the counsel, who now concern themselves so deeply for the tax payers, would not submit the case to a jury of those very tax payers. The defendants were compelled to try the case by the Judge, or to submit to the inconvenience of a change of venue. The Judge, a perfectly honest and highly capable, though not infallible gentleman, gave judgment for over \$25,000 against all the defendants but one, whose signature, it was conceded, had been forged.

The Supreme Court reversed the case on two grounds: 1st. The action was wrongly brought on the relation of the Treasurer of State; the proper relation being the Auditor of State. 2d. The defendants were discharged, some by false representation made by the Treasurer when he solicited their signatures; and the others by the fraudulent act of presenting them a bond to sign, on which appeared the signatures of other persons who were not bound.

The opinion of Judge Hannan presents a careful and elaborate examination of the law and displays learning and research. It is not possible for an unbiased mind to read his argument without a very strong impression that his ground is impregnable, and his conclusion incontrovertible with the interests of the public. It is hardly fair for counsel, after taking the pains to print in their petition for a re-hearing the entire opinion of the Court and the whole of the evidence, to make an appeal through the newspapers to the tax payers of the county as a means of re-enforcing their argument for a re-hearing. It would be a paltry Court that could be so cheaply intimidated.

The Eligibility of Governor Morton.

The Madison Courier, an intense Republican sheet, contains a communication from a correspondent which it terms one of the ablest and most experienced politicians of its age; taking grounds against the eligibility of Governor Morton to hold the office for another term. It makes but little, if any difference to the Democracy, whether the Republicans nominate O. P. Morton or Pop. Gov. Smith as their candidate for Governor, and one is as much entitled to public confidence as the other, but as His Excellency has been so great pains and expense to convince the people that he is constitutionally eligible to hold the office of Governor indefinitely, we give a Republican view of the question antagonistic to his claims. Says this able and most experienced Republican political correspondent of the Courier:

As this question is one purely of Constitutional law, it would be out of place to interpose suggestions, to interpolate anything of a personal or partisan character. The question is one that concerns the people of the entire State, and the vast public interests involved in the election of a Governor. O. P. Morton was elected and inaugurated as Lieutenant Governor, three days thereafter, Governor Lane, having vacated the office of Governor. O. P. Morton, Lieutenant Governor, was installed as Governor. The language of the Constitution, whatever may be said for or against its wisdom, is simple and easily understood, when it declares, see 1st, art. 5th, The executive power of the State shall be vested in a Governor. He shall hold his office during four years, and shall not be eligible more than four years in any period of eight years."

Reference to the debates in the Constitutional Convention on this clause will satisfy any one that the true intent and meaning of that body, in adopting this section, was to prevent the possibility of an executive incumbent employing the power and patronage of the office during one term, so as to secure its election to a second or subsequent term, thus doing all in its power to restrict the attention and fidelity of the executive to the proper discharge of the duties of that office. Has Governor P. Morton been Governor during the present term? If he has been Governor, he is ineligible for four years, and shall not be eligible more than four years in any period of eight years."

Secondly, the constitution provides in section 12, article 5, "The Governor shall be commander in chief of the military forces, and may call out the militia." "He (the Governor) shall, from time to time, give the General Assembly information touching the condition of the State, and recommend such measures as he shall deem expedient." Section 14 provides that every bill which shall pass the General Assembly shall be presented to the Governor, who shall approve or return it with his objections." Section 15 says "the Governor" shall have the power to grant reprieves, commutations, pardons, after conviction, &c., together with many other functions which the Constitution devolves directly on the Governor."

The present executive has done all this; he has been commander in chief of the militia of the State, he has called out the militia to repel invasion; he has communicated with the General Assembly, and given them information, and recommended such measures as he thought proper. We learn that the opinion was delivered by Hannan, and taken in any light, reflects no credit on him. If it expresses his opinion, he is no lawyer. If it does not, he is a dishonest man. In either event, he should be held accountable by the voters of the State. It is a decision in which not only the people of this county are interested, but also those of nearly every county in the State. We presume that, according to his logic, there are but few bonds of County Treasurers in the State that are worth the paper they are written upon.

We are pleased to learn that the attorneys for the State, Messrs. Holland and Buckley, are making an effort to obtain the reversing of the case; but whether they will succeed or not, we do not know. One thing, however, we do know—and that is, that justice and a true regard for sound and established principles of law, demand that the decision should be reversed.

The foregoing article from the National Defender published at Brookville, is rather a novel mode of urging the re-hearing of a case decided by the Supreme Court. It can hardly be supposed that when Mr. Holland is elected to the Supreme bench, he will consider such a mode of approach to his court either dignified or respectful. He ought not to set an example the imitation of which may plague the inventor.

The truth is, the case that arouses such a bitter outbreak of feeling, was a suit upon a County Treasurer's bond. The Treasurer had absconded with over \$20,000 of the State taxes; his securities were seized, and naturally enough saw their way to defend themselves. It was life and death with them, for most of them would have been ruined by an adverse judgment. On the other hand, if they were released, the tax upon the citizens of the county, to make good the delinquency, would have been a trifle in comparison.

There is an attempt to create a feeling on the part of the tax payers where none at present exists. When the case came up for trial, the counsel, who now concern themselves so deeply for the tax payers, would not submit the case to a jury of those very tax payers. The defendants were compelled to try the case by the Judge, or to submit to the inconvenience of a change of venue. The Judge, a perfectly honest and highly capable, though not infallible gentleman, gave judgment for over \$25,000 against all the defendants but one, whose signature, it was conceded, had been forged.

The Supreme Court reversed the case on two grounds: 1st. The action was wrongly brought on the relation of the Treasurer of State; the proper relation being the Auditor of State. 2d. The defendants were discharged, some by false representation made by the Treasurer when he solicited their signatures; and the others by the fraudulent act of presenting them a bond to sign, on which appeared the signatures of other persons who were not bound.

The opinion of Judge Hannan presents a careful and elaborate examination of the law and displays learning and research. It is not possible for an unbiased mind to read his argument without a very strong impression that his ground is impregnable, and his conclusion incontrovertible with the interests of the public. It is hardly fair for counsel, after taking the pains to print in their petition for a re-hearing the entire opinion of the Court and the whole of the evidence, to make an appeal through the newspapers to the tax payers of the county as a means of re-enforcing their argument for a re-hearing. It would be a paltry Court that could be so cheaply intimidated.

**Promotions.**  
The names of Colonels Gross, Colver, Wilder and Scribner were sent into the Senate on Tuesday for promotion to Brigadiers. It appears that after a protracted debate they were returned to the President with the information that only one more Brigadier General, in addition to those already appointed or nominated, was authorized by law, and requested that he should designate which of the four should fill the vacancy.

The Democratic State Central Committee of Ohio has fixed upon Monday, March 23, as the day for holding the State Convention, for the purpose of electing delegates to the National Convention, and nominating candidates for State officers.